Appl. No. 10/696,080

Group Art Unit: 3682

Amdt. Dated May 31, 2007

Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2007

**Remarks/Arguments** 

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of May 16, 2007

wherein proposed claims were discussed as against US6,213,552 to Miotto and US5,676,425 to

Pernicka. The Examiner asked that proposed claim 1 be amended to replace "join" with "joint"

to correct a clerical error and asked that proposed claim 1 be amended to clarify that the bearing

member moved vertically in order to better distinguish from Miotto. The Examiner indicated he

would need to further consider, and conduct a further search in respect of, the proposed claims.

Paragraph 26 of the description has been amended merely to correct grammatical errors.

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6 under 35 USC 112 on the basis that

the recitation of a "perpetual join" in claim 1 was inaccurate. Amended claim 1 avoids this

language and, therefore, the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner warned that if claim 26 was found allowable, claim 1 would be objected to

as a substantial duplicate thereof. With the amendments made to claims 1 and 23 by way of this

amendment, it is believed this potential objection is avoided.

This application has two independent claims: claims 1 and 23. The Examiner rejected

these claims as anticipated by US6,213,552 to Miotto.

Miotto shows a cam (254) including a protuberance (260) mounted on a pivot (252) and a

horizontally sliding bearing member (228) including a corresponding indentation. Miotto also

shows a horizontally sliding locking member (230).

Claim 1 requires "one of said pivot and said abutment being horizontally slidable" and a

bearing member which slides vertically when the cam is rotated. Miotto lacks this combination

Page 9 of 11

Appl. No. 10/696,080

Group Art Unit: 3682

Amdt. Dated May 31, 2007

Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2007

of features. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 avoids the anticipation rejection based on Miotto.

Miotto's protuberance only extends within his indentation in one position of the cam.

Claim 23 requires that "said sliding bearing member" slides "in a direction such that, when said cam is at said first rotation limit or said second rotation limit, and when said cam is between said first rotation limit and said second rotation limit, said protuberance extends within said indentation." It is therefore submitted that claim 23 avoids the anticipation rejection based on Miotto.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 25 USC 102 as anticipated by Pernicka.

Claim 23, as amended, recites "one of said cam and said slidable bearing having a protuberance, and the other of said cam and said slidable bearing having a corresponding indentation". Pernicka lacks this feature. Therefore, it is submitted that amended claim 23 is not anticipated by Pernicka.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Pernicka in view of Miotto. In this regard, the Examiner asserts it would be obvious to modify Pernicka to incoporate the protuberance and indentation of Miotto in order to provide a locking function. Applicant notes that with any such combination, since the bearing member of Pernicka is constrained against vertical motion (due to notches in the bearing member (94) being received by side rails (54)), as with Miotto, the protuberance would extend within the indentation only in one position of the cam. Therefore, the combination would lack the claim 23 feature of "said sliding bearing member sliding in a direction such that, when said cam is at said first rotation limit or said second rotation limit, and when said cam is between said first rotation limit and said second

Appl. No. 10/696,080 PATENT

Group Art Unit: 3682

Amdt. Dated May 31, 2007

Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2007

rotation limit, said protuberance extends within said indentation." It is therefore submitted that

claim 1 avoids the obviousness rejection based on Pernicka and Miotto.

On the basis that the independent claims patentably define over the references, the

remaining claims, which depend directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims, also

patentably define over the references.

In view of the foregoing, early favourable consideration of this application is earnestly

solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/SCOTT B. STROHM/

Scott B. Strohm

Registration No. 42,172

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.

2555 Grand Blvd.

Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613

Tel: (816) 474-6550

Fax: (816) 421-5547

May 31, 2007

(05171-132 RDF:bw)

Page 11 of 11

2485254v1